This record is a partial extract of the original cable. The full text of the original cable is not available.

UNCLAS SECTION 01 OF 02 ANKARA 003603

STDDTS

DEPARTMENT FOR INR/R/MR, EUR/SE, EUR/PD, NEA/PD, DRL JCS PASS J-5/CDR S. WRIGHT

E.O. 12958: N/A
TAGS: OPRC KMDR TU
SUBJECT: ANKARA MEDIA REACTION REPORT,
FRIDAY, JUNE 25, 2004

THIS REPORT WILL PRESENT A TURKISH PRESS SUMMARY UNDER THREE THEMES:

HEADLINES BRIEFING EDITORIAL OPINION

HEADLINES

MASS APPEAL
President Bush: I would like to spend my holiday in Turkey Hurriyet
Bombs did not change Bush program in Turkey - Aksam
FM Gul: No US demand for new Turkish bases - Aksam
El-Al suspends Istanbul flights - Milliyet
Iraqi hell: 100 killed, 320 injured - Sabah
Socialist International meets in Istanbul - Milliyet
Iran releases captive Britons - Sabah

OPINION MAKERS
Bush to urge NATO protection for Iraq at Istanbul summit Zaman
Bush to ask NATO to train Iraqi forces - Radikal
Washington wants new defense deal with Turkey - Cumhuriyet
Talabani suggests general amnesty for PKK - Zaman
Turkmen: Unrest in Kirkuk may cause civil war - Yeni Safak
Violence growing in Iraq - Radikal
Resisters strike at five Iraqi cities - Cumhuriyet
BBC to set up Arabic channel - Radikal
Athens happy about efforts to reopen Halki Seminary - Zaman

BRIEFING

President Bush due in Turkey: Turkish papers expect President Bush to voice support for Turkey's EU membership at the June 25-26 US-EU Summit in Dublin, Ireland. Bush will highlight the constructive attitude of Turkey during the UN-backed negotiations for reunification of Cyprus, and will press EU leaders to grant Ankara a date for entry talks. "Cumhuriyet" does not expect President Bush to announce a US package of measures about Cyprus. US sources say that changes may be needed in some US laws and regulations in order to take steps forward. Therefore, discussion of a Cyprus package' during the Bush visit are not realistic, "Cumhuriyet" reports. Turkish papers also expect Ankara to urge President Bush to authorize US military action to remove the terrorist PKK presence from northern Iraq. On Thursday, FM Gul denied news stories claiming that President Bush would convey a list of new military demands during his visit to Ankara.

Washington wants new defense deal with Turkey: "Cumhuriyet" reports that the US believes the 1980 Defense and Economic Cooperation Agreement with Turkey is outdated, and that a new arrangement that would better fit the defense requirements of both countries. Ankara thinks that the US is mainly interested in the defense aspect of the agreement, and did not care about its economic side. Washington believes the world and the threat have changed since the agreement was signed, and that a new military approach should be developed in line with those changes. In a recent visit to Ankara, US Assistant Secretary of State Lincoln Bloomfield said the future status of Incirlik Airbase depends on the outcome of the strategic dialogue between officials of the two countries. Bloomfield's remarks were evaluated as an indication of Washington's efforts to bring a new definition to its strategic cooperation with Turkey. Talabani calls for amnesty for PKK: Patriotic Union of Iraqi Kurdistan (PUK) leader Jalal Talabani on Thursday called for a general amnesty for members of the outlawed PKK/Kongra-Gel. Talabani said the PKK was now divided into three, and said that the more pacifist wing led by Osman Ocalan was supporting a political struggle. "Most PKK members would return to their houses if a general amnesty were declared," Talabani stressed. Talabani also noted that he did not expect the US to launch a military operation against the PKK, and said the Iraqi interim government should take a decision for such an action. EDITORIAL OPINION:

"President Bush's Visit"

Hasan Mesut Hazar commented in the conservative Turkiye "A majority of the Turkish public thinks that President Bush has created a great deal of chaos in the world through his mistaken policies. They believe that the American fight against terrorism is really an effort to gain hegemony over the region and its oil resources. President Bush is to arrive in Turkey in this negative atmosphere. Moreover, the PKK issue makes things even worse. His arrival highlights the unmet promise by the US side about the elimination of PKK terrorism in northern Iraq. These issues, which are of particular interest to Turkey, naturally overshadow the NATO summit. It is hard to understand the US silence about the PKK and its bloody terrorism. It creates a serious credibility gap for President Bush, because he is using the fight against global terrorism to justify his every policy, whether right or wrong. Let's hope President Bush is going to make some gestures and announce measures on this issue so that the overall negative atmosphere decreases. Otherwise, both his Ankara trip and the efforts to add new missions to NATO are doomed to fail. Turkey and the US need the strategic partnership more than ever before.'

"What is NATO's Aim?" Taha Akyol commented in the mass appeal Milliyet (6/25): "At the moment the Middle East is a region in crisis. Most likely it will continue to be the world's most problematic region for another fifty years. Public unrest, corrupt and repressive regimes, unresolved border claims, terrorism, and oil all contribute to the dangerous mix. Just like the Balkans at the beginning of the 20th century, today the Middle East affects the whole world through its instability. Turkey is considered by many as a kind of solution to this problem. However, clashes of interests and opinions are preventing a further definition of this solution. Therefore, if NATO tries to spread its activities to a broader geography, it will lose its effectiveness and cracks within its own structure could widen. NATO should be very careful, especially on the Middle East. The US representative to NATO, Nicholas Burns, during his speech in Prague on October 19, 2003, said that `NATO's main duty is still to defend North America and Western Europe. But, I don't think we can fulfill this duty from where we sit. We have to direct our attention and military power to the south and east. I believe NATO's future is in the south and east, it is in the Greater Middle East.' Burns' formulation is problematic. It is certainly true that the Middle East is in crisis, but the solution is not to be found in NATO. Counter-terrorism is a must, but the necessary changes in the Middle East must be realized through economic and social development. NATO's new function should not be to create more enemies, but to support security, stability and development " development.

EDELMAN